

Case No. 1:13-cv-01064
Gwin, J.

needed to prove their defenses.

Moreover, to the extent that Nilsson requests an order requiring Defendants to keep discovered information silent, Nilsson provides no basis to override the “‘long-established legal tradition’ which values public access to court proceedings.”^{5/} Unwarranted restriction of court documents hampers the public’s ability to act as an important check on judicial integrity.^{6/} Thus, in the Sixth Circuit, courts approach protective order motions with a presumption in favor of public access to judicial records.^{7/}

A successful protective order motion must show specifically that disclosure of particular information would cause serious harm.^{8/} In this case, Nilsson merely says that disclosure would breach his agreement with MP Antenna. MP Antenna This is not enough.

The Court, therefore, **DENIES** Nilsson’s motion for a protective order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 23, 2014

s/ James S. Gwin
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

^{5/}[*Procter & Gamble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co.*, 78 F.3d 219, 227 \(6th Cir. 1996\)](#) (quoting [*Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. FTC*, 710 F.2d 1165, 1177 \(6th Cir. 1983\)](#)).

^{6/}See [*Brown & Williamson*, 710 F.2d at 1179](#); [*Wilson v. Am. Motors Corp.*, 759 F.2d 1568, 1570 \(11th Cir. 1985\)](#) (observing that “trials are public proceedings” and that access to court records preserves “the rights of the public, an absent third party”).

^{7/}See, e.g., [*In re Perrigo Co.*, 128 F.3d 430, 447 \(6th Cir. 1997\)](#).

^{8/}See, e.g., [*Brown & Williamson*, 710 F.2d at 1179-80](#).